# THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

*EDITED BY THE REV. PITT MORSE.*

*"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men."* St. Luke, 2. 14.

*"How beautiful are the feet of him that publisheth salvation!"* Isa. 52. 7.

VOL. I. SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1823. NO. 16.


## CORRESPONDENCE.

*For the Herald of Salvation.*

MR. EDITOR,

If you should think that the publication of the following correspondence, will conduce to the dissemination of Gospel Truth, you will confer a favor on a number of your readers by giving it an insertion in the Herald.

S.

*Extract of a letter from E. to A.*

I would again caution you against imbibing error. Did you get your system of religion by diligently searching the Bible, praying God to direct and guide you into all truth; or did you get it by hearing other people argue? I would advise you to examine the subject thoroughly, without dwelling too much upon the fair side of the picture; weigh the system in itself and see how it will bear. God says "he would that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth, and that he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked forsake his ways and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and turn to God," &c. You will find through the whole chain of the Bible, no promise without a condition; he has said "the willing and obedient shall eat the fruit of the land, but the wicked shall be destroyed and that without remedy;" he has said "he will rain upon the wicked, snares, fire and brimstone;" he has said too "he will laugh at their calamity, he will mock when their fear cometh; when their destruction cometh as a whirlwind and their desolation as a flood;" he has said "the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." You see there is a curse denounced upon the *finally impenitent*, and we are naturally led to enquire the cause: Christ answers it with his own words, "Behold I have stretched out my arms all the day long, &c. because you have lived in sin, transgressed my laws, violated my commands, and brought upon yourselves the righteous judgment of God, depart ye cursed." If you ask me why I believe in the eternal damnation of impenitent sinners, I answer because God has sworn and he will not violate his oath; "therefore I swear in my wrath, these shall never enter my rest." God is not a man that he should lie, or the son of man that he should repent.

Besides the abundant proofs in Scripture against Universalism, our experience with mankind teaches us its fallacy; I find it to be the case generally, that after a man has contracted habits of licentiousness and dissipation, and rendered himself by his conduct unfit for respectable society, he attaches himself to your system of religion, and becomes its firm supporter. You stand upon the very last notch of human invention, and if you sink, you sink unaccompanied, perhaps, by any denomination on earth; whereas, if the principles of election or free agency fail, they have only to step a little lower, and go as securely to heaven on your foundation as if they had never advocated any other. But what would you say in the end, if your system should prove fallacious? For you there is no consolation, you must inevitably sink to ruin.

E.

*The Answer.*

Dear Brother,

From the style of your letter of the 17th of April last, I consider you as challenging an answer; which I shall now endeavor to give you as well as my feeble abilities will admit. You begin by cautioning me against imbibing error in my religious opinions; for which friendly admonition you have my sincere thanks. You ask me whether I got my system by diligently searching the Bible &c. or whether I got it by hearing other people argue? To which I answer, I do not pin my faith on the sleeve of any man, or set of men; it is the Bible, and that alone, which I take as the rule and guide of my faith; and there I find amply delineated, the true character of our heavenly Father, who "is good unto *all* and his tender mercies are over *all* his works." You then quote a part of the words of St. Paul to Timothy, and connect with them parts of sentences from the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah; I am at a loss to comprehend your motive in quoting the words of St. Paul, for if you will turn to the passage in I. Tim. II. 4, you will find that the words in that verse, taken in connexion with the three preceding and the two subsequent verses, are as directly opposed to the horrid doc-

trine of partial salvation, as any words which can be conceived. God "will have all men to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth;" and if such be the will of God, I would seriously ask you if it is possible for wicked men, angels or devils, to frustrate that will? Will the Almighty be eternally disappointed? or rather does he not "work all things after the counsel of his own will?" and finally, will he not "do all his pleasure?" These propositions, I humbly conceive, are too plain to need any further illustration.

You say that, "you will find through the whole chain of the Bible no promise without a condition! Where was the condition of the promise, made to our first Parents in the garden, that the seed of the women should bruise the serpent's head? Was there a condition in the promise made to Abraham Gen. XII, 3 "and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed"? And again, Gen. XVIII, 18 "Seeing that Abraham shall become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him?" Was there a condition in the same promise renewed to Isaac and Jacob, that in them and their seed should all the nations and kindreds of the earth be blessed? Where is the condition in the promise which God made to the Saviour, that he would give him "the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession?" Was there a condition in the promise of God, by the prophet Isaiah, that "In this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast," &c.? Isa. XXV. 6, 7. 8. Where is the condition in the promise of God by the same prophet, Ch. XLV. 23, 24, 25, "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear," &c.? Was there a condition in the promise of God. Jer. XXXI. 34, "And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord; for *all shall know me* from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more?" Did God reserve any thing, when he gave *all* things into the hands of the Son? And was there any condition in the promise of our Saviour, "all that the Father giveth me, shall come to me; and he that cometh to me. I will in no wise cast out?" These are but a few of the many unequivocal and unconditional promises contained in the Scriptures; but I trust they are enough to show you the palpable error of your assertion; and if all these should fail, where do we stand? And what hope can we have in what you term conditional promises, if the sure promises of God, which were confirmed by his oath, should finally prove of no effect? With regard to the threatnings which you have quoted from the Psalms, Proverbs, &c. until you can show that they relate to a future state of existence, I shall pass them by without any further notice.

The passage which you pretend to quote from the parable of the sheep and goats, in the 25th chapter of Mathew, deserves some attention. I well know, that it is the commonly received opinion, that Christ, in that parable, was speaking of events, which should take place, when the heavens and earth should be passed away; or in other words, at the last judgment. But I humbly conceive that he was speaking of no such events. You will observe, that what our Saviour says, in this parable, is a continuation of a discourse which is begun at the commencement of the 23d chapter, and is continued to the end of the 25th, which (the 25th) begins thus, "*Then* shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins &c.—evidently referring to a time, of which he had been speaking; and, when is that time? We have the answer in the 24th chapter from the 39th to the 35th verses inclusive. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken; and then shall appear the sign of the son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory; and he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other, &c. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled; heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."—Hence you will observe that our Saviour had been speaking of events, which were then soon to take place; and his subsequent conversation related to events, that should take place at the same time. If the question, as to the time, should again arise, you have the answer in the 15th verse of the (24th) chapter, "When ye therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation &c." evidently alluding to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, by the Romans, which event took place at the time spoken of by our Saviour. For further information of the time when Christ should come in his kingdom &c. See Math. X, 23,—XVI, 27 28, to

gether with the last verse of the 8th and the first verse of the 9th Chapters of Mark, when I think you cannot avoid the conclusion that the events of which our Saviour was speaking, were such as were actually to take place, before the generation to which he spake, should have passed away.

Having as I believe fully answered you with respect to the words, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal," and shown, that the passage alluded to the destruction, and and casting away of the Jews, from which destruction, but a remnant was saved, and the bringing in of the Gentiles to the privileges of the gospel, which we frequently find represented by the word life; I shall next take notice of your expression, when you say, "you see there is a curse denounced upon the *finally impenitent.*" Until you can shew that the scriptures speak of the "finally impenitent.", I shall very much doubt your authority for saying, there is a curse denounced upon them; and I now assure you, that you cannot find such an expression between the two lids of the Bible.

You next proceed to give your reasons for believing in the doctrine of endless damnation; and say, that God has sworn, and will not violate his oath; "Therefore I *swear* in my wrath, *these* shall *never* enter into my rest;" here I must inform you, that you have mi-quoted the scripture; you have put the verb "swear" in the present tense and instead of the words "they" and "not" you have put in "these" and "never." The passage (Ps. XCV. 11) reads thus "unto whom I *sware* in my wrath, that they should not enter into my rest," and the Apostle, in quoting from the Psalmist says. So I sware in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest." Here you will observe that the verb in both instances, is in the past tense; and if you will take your bible, and read the whole of the 95th Psalm, and the whole of the 3d, chap. of Hebrews, you will find, that, both the Psalmist and Apostle alluded to those who "hardened their hearts in the provocation, in the day of temptation, in the wildernes; of which, you will find a full account in the 17th chap. of Exodus, and in the 14th chap. of Numbers, which I request you to read; when I think you must be fully convinced, that the words you have quoted, to prove the unmerciful doctrine of endless damnation; so far from proving any such event, have no allusion to it whatever; but refer wholly to those hardened, unbelieving Israelites, who fell in their journey through the wilderness and who were not suffered to enter into that land of promise or of rest, which they were seeking: and even Moses, was only permitted, from the summit of Mount Nebo, to look forward to the place of rest, but "he died, and was gathered to his people" without entering into it.

You say "God is not a man that he should lie, or the son man that he should repent;" it is from that circumstance, my dear brother, I derive my highest consolation;—"He is the Lord, he changeth not, therefore we are not consumed," and whilst Jehovah of Hosts, continues to be God, I will never be afraid to trust him, as my only refuge in times of distress, and as the Eternal Rock of my soul's salvation; neither do I fear that the Devil will ever be able to overthrow his kingdom, or thwart his eternal purposes.

Having as I conceive, answered you, with regard to the scriptures, you have pretended to quote, in support of the soul chilling doctrine of endless, unmerciful torture; and having briefly explained the several passages you have made use of; I will now proceed to take some notice of the remaining part of your letter, in which you do not even pretend to quote scripture, in support of the opinions you advance; and in which I cannot believe, that you reflected seriously on what you were writing; but if you did; you must be astonishingly ignorant of the principles, which you attempt to oppose.—You say, "Besides the abundant proofs in scripture against Universalism, our experience with mankind, teaches us its fallacy." In what manner, I would ask you, does our experience teach us, that God will not "in the dispensation of the fullness of times, gather together in one, *all things* in Christ both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him." Does our experience teach us, that, God will not "swallow up death in victory?" or that the Lord God will not "wipe away tears from off all faces," or "take away the rebuke of his people from off all the earth?" Has any one of us had such experience, as to go to the eternal world, and there ascertain, that God will not "finish transgression, make an end of sin, and bring in everlasting righteousness?" or that he will not finally restore the whole world of mankind to a state of holiness, and consequently to a state of happiness and endless felicity? I think you must be convinced, that "our experience with mankind," can give us but very little knowledge, of the eternal purposes of the Almighty; and that if we wish to obtain that knowledge, we must search for it in the Scriptures of divine Truth, and not trust to our "experience with mankind" in matters of

cerniug which, experience can teach us nothing.

With respect to the licentious tendency of the doctrine of Universal Benevolence, I think reason, and my own "experience with mankind," teach me that it is far otherwise. I will not attempt to deny, but that some, who *profess* to believe the doctrine, are such characters as you describe; but that Universalists, generally, are licentious characters, or as much so as their opposers say, is what I most positively deny; & I likewise deny, that the doctrine has the least tendency to licentiousness; but on the contrary, it lays its believers under the strongest obligations, to "live soberly, righteously and Godly, in this present world."

Without intending to condemn the religious sentiments of any denomination of christians; I would ask, which doctrine has the greatest tendency to licentiousness; that, which teaches, that every man must receive according to the deeds done in the body, and that for all his sins, he must receive an adequate punishment; or that, which teaches, that a man may live in sin and transgression, through nearly the whole of a long life; but, if he sincerely repents and becomes converted, only one short day, or even one hour before death, he shall be immediately received to glory, and escape all the punishment due to his crimes? No one will deny, but that the former will have a far greater tendency to deter mankind from the commission of crimes, and to promote virtue, morality and religion in life, than the latter; the former is the sincere belief of every real Universalist, and the latter, of those who believe in endless damnation.

You observe, that I "stand upon the very last notch of human invention!" I am astonished, my dear brother, at the expression! How can you call that the last notch of human invention," which was proclaimed by the angels of God, to the trembling Shepherds, while tending their flocks on the plains of Judea? "Fear not: for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which *shall be to all people.*" Here you see, that the doctrine which I believe, was proclaimed by the Angels from Heaven; and on the proclamation being made, "suddenly there was with the angel, a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men." The same doctrine was preached by Peter, (Acts III, 20. 21.) "And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God has spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began." If the "restitution of all things," has been declared by God, by the mouth of all his *holy prophets* since the world began, I would ask, What must be the character of those prophets and preachers, who have been, and still are proclaiming a doctrine, directly the reverse of that which God declared? viz. the doctrine of the restitution of only a small part. I think, that on reflection, you will be careful how you again call that glorious doctrine, which has been proclaimed in such a manner to the world, "the last notch of human invention," and that you will rather admit, that the doctrines which have been promulgated, since the commencement of the sixteenth century, by that murderous, and bloody minded John Calvin, and his deluded followers, better deserves the name of "the last notch of human invention," then the doctrine to which you have seen fit to give that name; although Calvinism is considered the orthodox religion of the day.

The only remaining expression of your's, which I shall notice at this time is the following, that, "if the principles of election or free agency fail, they have only to step a little lower, and go as securely to Heaven on my foundation, as if they had never advocated any other." Oh! superstition and prejudice! how far will you carry your votaries? Of what inconsistencies will you not cause them to be guilty? I have frequently heard the same expression used, by those who oppose the doctrine of impartial benevolence; but I charitably trust that you and all others, who make the expression, are not aware of the extent of its signification. To me it appears something like this; that those who believe in this manner, are willing to reject the Grace and Mercy of God, and build themselves a ladder of their own works, on which they intend to climb to Heaven; while others, who have not those pharisaical materials of which to build a ladder, must eternally remain behind; but if their ladder should finally break and fail them, they will, as a *last* resort, trust themselves to the *goodness* and forgiving *mercy* of God! But let all such remember, that, "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." 1. Cor. 3. 11, which I wish you to read, together with the whole chapter. God says by the Prophet Isaiah, "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation, a Stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation." This is the foundation on which I trust; and it is the same which Peter says, Acts 4, 2, "is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner." Have we not reason to believe that many

modern builders are willing to reject this "chief corner stone, elect precious," and trust to the sandy foundation of self-righteousness? I trust you will not again speak of stepping a little *lower* in order to get upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord."

I had intended to introduce some more proofs from Scripture in support of my belief; but time fails me, and I must conclude this long letter, by "praying God to guide and direct you into all truth," and assuring you that I am your ever affectionate brother. A.

P. S. I must earnestly request you, in future, when you attempt to prove any position by Scripture, to quote it as it is; and not take detached and mutilated parts of sentences, and put them together in such a manner, as to make out a sentence, the meaning of which, shall be totally different from any which you can find in the Bible; and this you have done in more than one instance in your letter, which now lies before me.—Take the following for one example—"Because you have lived in sin, transgressed my laws, violated my commands and brought upon yourselves the righteous judgment of God, depart ye cursed."—If you will inform me in what part of the Bible, that sentence or any thing like it can be found, I promise you, that I will acknowledge I am mistaken, A.

# THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1823.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD.

DEAR SIR.

I hereby acknowledge the friendly attention bestowed by you upon a communication, containing two *important* questions in relation to Salvation, and tender you my thanks for the christian candour displayed in your remarks. With your treatment of the subject I am much pleased and with your arguments generally *satisfied*. There is one point however, which is not satisfactorily exemplified. It is my second question.

You answer my second question by saying "that men are *forgiven all* their *sins*, by being made the subjects of the all-conquering influence of divine grace." This forgiveness you seem to think is communicated after having received *all* the punishment due for *sin*. Upon this subject, I think you are far from being ambiguous. If I then understand you, the subject is plain. You tell us what forgiveness is, and when it is communicated. If I understand you, your opinion or doctrine is, that men receive a full *punishment* for their *sins*, and after this are *forgiven*. Forgiven what? why their sins to be sure, must be the answer. Here Mr. Editor is the difficulty; I cannont tell how a man can be *forgiven* and at the same time be punished fully for the *offence* committed: I understand pardon or forgiveness to be a remission of all punishment due the transgressor. I beg leave to illustrate my views by a similitude. A. owes B. ten dollars, A. is poor, he is unable to pay a fraction; B. says, I know A. that you are poor, I pity you and as an evidence that I pity you, I will forgive you the debt. How does he forgive it? Answer according to the doctrine assumed by you; He forgives B. after he, (B.) has paid every fraction of the ten dollars.—Mark Sir, B. is not able to pay any thing, but C. a friend of B. comes forward and voluntarily cancels the demand. Now who would deserve the thanks of B. the most, A. or C.? I know according to the trinitarian hypothesis, A. and C. are one and the same person and of course it would not be material who in form was thanked, inasmuch as if you thanked A. you would C. and if you thanked C., A. would be thanked. This idea, I reject Mr. Editor, as the most absurd, and as perfect nonsense.

I acknowledge with pleasure that you have displayed a great deal of ingenuity in your 16th paragraph, and am confident that the reason there adopted is truly worthy of admiration. But Sir, I am not satisfied upon the subject yet. Do tell me how GOD *forgives sin* and at the same time punishes it, and I will consider you my best, my most worthy, my most beneficial friend. My dear friend we are on the verge of the grave, soon this earthly tabernacle will be exchanged for one of an endless duration, and O! may GOD give us the truth, may we have right notions of GOD and his character, may we understand his moral government, and form a correct idea of his divine economy.

May GOD bless you Sir, and your labours.

Yours in love.

ERASMUS.

## REMARKS.

We are much gratified to learn that our Correspondent views so favourably, the *Remarks* in answer to his questions, contained in our 12th No. and that he is "generally satisfied" with our arguments. We are of opinion that a correct idea respecting the proper definition of a single word, would close the discussion to the entire satisfaction

not only of Erasmus, but of every candid, intelligent inquirer.

The only point respecting which E. is not yet satisfied, is stated in the following language, "I cannot tell how a man can be forgiven, and at the same time be punished fully for the offence committed. I understand pardon or forgiveness to be a remission of all punishment due the transgressor." This is indeed the difficulty, and the *only* difficulty. Whoever understands *forgiveness* to be a *remission*, or relinquishment of all punishment, justly *due* the transgressor, can never reconcile forgiveness with *justice*, righteousness, truth or scripture.

The erroneous definition of the word *pardon*, and pernicious misconstruction of the doctrine of divine *forgiveness*, has been produced by opinions the most absurd and contradictory; and by not noticing the necessary—the *indissoluble* connexion between *vice* and *misery*: which are universally and invariably connected as *cause* and *effect*.—We might as reasonably expect that the *effect* of severing a man's head from his body, would not be *death*; as to expect that *sin* will not necessarily be attended with its natural *effect* which is suffering, *punishment* or misery! All the exertions, therefore, which the lovers, or the subjects of iniquity may make, to free themselves, or others from the punishment of sin, when committed, must be forever futile. In our first reply to Erasmus we scripturally defined *forgiveness* to be, *not* a relinquishment of just punishment—but a manifestation of God's eternal mercy to sinners. Let this definition be received and all difficulty, darkness and doubt on this beautifully instructive subject, vanishes like the thick darkness before the effulgent, morning sun. We have said, "To pretend that God saves men from deserved punishment, would be denying the goodness of God; by saying, either, that God never intended punishment for the good of man, or that God himself deprives man of the good, he designed for him, by withholding that punishment which would do the sinner good." If this be incontrovertibly true, our definition of forgiveness, or a similar one *must* be admitted.

We have said "That men are forgiven all their sins, by being made the subjects of the all conquering influence of divine grace"—and lest our language should be misunderstood, we have added, "But they cannot be so *forgiven* any sin, as to prevent their receiving the good intended for them, or violate immutable, eternal justice, or invalidate the scriptures of truth."

The similitude which Erasmus has given relative to the payment of a debt due from A. to B. is inapplicable, for the plain reason that *guilt* cannot be transfered—but *money* may be transfered. Besides, if one man owe another, and the creditor relinquish the debt, the word GIVE would be more appropriate than the word FORGIVE. There is a wide difference between *giving* a man a sum of money, and *forgiving* the transgression of sinners.

The idea that one *person* may pay a debt to another *person*, and the receiver still be entitled to gratitude from the debtor because both *persons* are *one* person, or being: is as absurd, as for a man to pay a debt (due himself,) to himself and thank himself for his own disinterested generosity!

With our correspondent we reciprocate the testimony of good will, and expect that he will let us again hear from him—that he will either point out the fallacy of our views, or admit their truth and propriety.

---

MR. EDITOR,

I have just discovered in your paper of May 17th, a letter addressed to me, by Mr. George B. Lisher, with objections against a paragraph contained in my reply to Mr. Truair. The circumstances which led to the insertion of that paragraph, were as follow:

I published a small book entitled "Plain Truth" unfavorable to Pedobaptism, shown by letters to Rev. John Truair, containing a brief reply to his book, entitled "Plain Truth, or Christian Baptism and Communion." In the 14th letter where I examined the *tendency of free communion*, I stated as the 4th objection against it, that "It builds up in theory, and pulls down in practice." In proof of this, I stated the opinion which the Pedobaptists entertain of the *Baptists*, *Arminians*, *Universalists* and *Quakers*, without giving any views of my own. This I did to show the inconsistency between their general treatment of these denominations and their invitations at the Lord's table. Seldom do we see a greater want of candour than Mr. L. has shown in his remarks upon the paragraph in question. Had I misstated the opinion of the *Pedobaptists* respecting the Universalists, I stand accountable to *them* for it, and am ready to hear the charge from *them*; but not to Mr. L. nor any other Universalist, but if I correctly stated the opinions of the Pedobaptists, it is enough without giving their reasons for such opinions, seeing I had no more to do with them than with the heavy charges against my own denomination, which were these:—

To the Baptists—"We view your neglect of your children as a great crime, you cast them on the uncovenanted mercies of God—you make them heathen—you do not pay

that regard to them which you do to the lambs of your flock—you make baptism a saving ordinance. How can such persons possess the spirit of Christ."* It is added on the same page as explanatory of the above, that "were it necessary, we might add other names and refer to authorities, to show that language similar to the above is often used." I might, therefore, with as much propriety, expect an attack from a Baptist, as from the Universalists; what is my opinion of the Universalists is to be collected elsewhere; in my book nothing has been said to express it. When and where I deliver it, I choose generally to offer my reasons, notwithstanding my "*known opposition to the doctrine of Universal Salvation.*" Every candid person will see that this unprovoked attack affords me the opportunity of applying some of Mr. Lisher's sentences to himself.

"The man who will not examine premises before he makes conclusions, is not entitled to the honour nor even the name of the logician, the scholar, or the philosopher."—Again—

"It is hoped Sir, that you will see the impropriety of your charge, and immediately make that acknowledgment to the public which they have a right to expect."

By inserting the above in your paper immediately, or returning it you will oblige yours. JASON LATHROP.

Newport, June 7th 1823.

---

*An inquiry designed to ascertain whether it is the duty of Christians to encourage the present Missionary Establishments.*

*Concluded.*

I had rather he would believe in no God, than that the Creator of heaven and earth will punish him for those sins which he never committed. I had rather he would sacrifice himself to Juggernaut, than that he should murder himself, his wife and children, to screen him and them from the wrath of an almighty, offended God. He, as a Pagan, would die full of hope, in confident assurance of everlasting happiness; but as a Calvinist, he would drop into the arms of a being, impatient to blast him to interminable woe. If he were converted to Calvinism, he would believe that God had doomed millions of his fair creation, by an irrevocable decree, to eternal wretchedness, for the sins of another being; that it was impossible for him to do right; like a damaged clock, which, if it go at all, must go wrong; that it would be far better for him never to have been born, than to have come into existence under the circumstances of the non-elect. I had rather be a Pagan than a Calvinist; for if I must be deprived of the felicity of worshipping a good God, I would more willingly bow down to a lifeless, harmless idol, than to a being who had reprobated those creatures to eternal and entire torment which he brought into being, who live or die at his word, and whose very existence must be an everlasting curse to them.

With such views, I cannot think it my duty to encourage missionaries; and christian brethren, I appeal to you, whether the moral condition, of the Pagans would be changed for the better, were they all to embrace Calvinism. But when people are blinded and driven forward impetuously by a crazy zeal, they never reason, they never stop to reflect. They hear the echo of the general vociferation; they are seized with a mad fervor, and become dupes to the artifice of a hypocritical and designing priesthood. Their imagination paints for them the burning pit, and the haggard genius of idolatry pouring its fatally deceived myriads into it. They think they hear sometimes the dreadful outcries of the forlorn victims; and they wonder why christians have not noticed the subject before, and been incited to action by it. They are anxious that the heathen should put off their idolatry immediately, but seem to care not what they receive in exchange.

Upon the whole I am inclined to believe, that the present excitement in favor of missions is produced, in many cases, more by the spirit of proselytism, than by a desire to benefit the heathen. This spirit perhaps is not the only incentive to action, but it is a very powerful one. If the clergy generally, who are in favor of the present missionary establishments, were incited by a strong desire to benefit the heathen, they would be more willing to contribute of their own substance, than they ever yet have been. I will not deny that they have done their part at begging. But why have they not been as willing to give, as beg? Why are the hard earnings of the poor man snatched from his hands? Why is the bread taken from the orphan's mouth? Where are our rich clergy, who are possessed of their thousands, who do not spend the simple interest of their money, whose exorbitant salaries, which are not needed by them, are annually increasing their already abundant possessions? Have they given to missions as many cents as they have taken dollars from those who eat their bread in the sweat of their face? Our Saviour said, that there were those in his day who would compass

* Mr. L. is informed that inverted commas mark quotations.

sea and land to make even one proselyte, that would be two-fold more the child of hell after his change, than those who were the instruments of it. It would be better for him to remain as he was, than to change from bad to worse. And that these ancient missionaries were like our modern ones, at least in one respect, is evident, for they bound heavy burdens, and grevious to be borne, and laid them on men's shoulders; but they themselves would not move them with one of their fingers.

The foregoing considerations have weighed heavily in my mind. I confess that I have surveyed this subject without being fired with the enthusiasm for which many, favorable to missions are noted, and I hope I have done it without prejudice. Let the reader determine. If he thinks it his duty to patronize missions as they are now conducted, I blame him not. "To his own master he standeth or falleth."

RICHARDS.

## POETRY.

### RELIGION.

1. What is Religion? Is it a round,
Of formal duty, empty sound?
A zeal which men possess?
Of Piety, a great display?
A secret *something*, which we say,
That others don't possess?

2. Is't to assent to certain creeds;
Condemning all, whose reason leads,
To doubt, or to reject,
What Orthodox Divines would have,
Each son of Adam, to believe,
To prove him "God's *Elect*?"

3. No: pure religion, undefiled,
Is to assist the orphan child,
The widow, poor, forlorn;
All suff'ring poor, by want distress'd
To feel for all, by woes depress'd
By keenest anguish torn:

4. To live an upright, honest life;
Avoid intemperance, envy strife,
And slander, worst of all;
Which basely seeks to raise a name,
By blasting others well earn'd fame,
Exulting in their fall.

5. Than this, what else can serve to prove,
Our true benevolence, our love,
To God, and all mankind?
What more in life can satisfy?
And when, in prospect, death is nigh,
What more will calm the mind?

6. Why treat with scorn, the honest man,
Who differs from our gospel plan?
In many things, or few?
Equal with us, he shares the love,
Of God, who rules below, above,
If Heathen, Theist, Jew.

7. Perhaps we find his reasoning powers,
Æqually strong, as clear as ours;
As much, or more in use
To reason, *all* have equal right;
Then why should zealous bigots fight,
Or vent their strange abuse?

8. How long shall Superstition reign?
How long ere reason will regain,
In man, her long lost right?
Methinks the happy time draws near,
When *all* mankind, her voice shall hear,
And *all* receive *True Light*."

9. O God of heav'n! To Thee we pray,
In faith; that thou wilt haste the day,
When *all*, thy *love* shall see!
Religion *pure* will then abound;
Then will the earth, the air, resound,
With songs of praise to thee!

H. H.

## MR. SAURIN'S VIEW OF THE DOCTRINE OF ETERNAL MISERY.

After having preached a lengthy discourse to prove the truth of the doctrine of endless misery, he observes thus, "I sink, I sink under the awful weight of my subject; and I declare, when I see my friends, my relations, the people of my charge, this whole congregation; when I think that I, that you, that we are all threatened with these torments; when I see in the lukewarmness of my devotions, in the languor of my love, in the levity of my resolutions and designs, the least evidence, though it be only presumptive, of my future misery, yet I find in the thought a mortal poison, which diffuseth itself into every period of my life, rendering society tiresome, nourishment insipid, pleasure disgustful, and life itself a cruel bitter. I cease to wonder that the fear of hell hath made some mad and others melancholy."

NOTICE.

It may be expected that the Editor of this Paper will deliver a Lecture in the School House at Sackets Harbour on Thursday the 10th of July at 4 o'clock P. M.

*JUST PUBLISHED,*

AND FOR SALE AT THE BOOK STORE IN THIS VILLAGE, A SERMON ON THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION, BY THE EDITOR OF THIS PAPER. PRICE 12½ CENTS.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY, IN WATERTOWN, N. Y. AT $1 PER ANN. PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

*****

S. A. ABBEY, PRINTER.